DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 447 SP 021 048

AUTHOR Davis, Brian K.
TITLE Field Experience: What is It? Why is It Out There?
PUB DATE Apr 82
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; *Cooperating Teachers; Educational Principles; *Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; Role Models; Role Perception; *Student Teacher Supervisors; *Student Teaching; Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

It is widely accepted that laboratory experiences are both necessary and worthwhile for preservice teacher education. Research has shown little evidence of what exactly happens during student teaching, although studies have illuminated roles and objectives. Guidance in or supervision of field experiences for student teachers often falls primarily to the classroom teacher in whose classroom the experience takes place. The professional and personal maturity of the classroom teacher needs to be considered as does that teacher's skill in teaching and supervising. The teacher and principal need to be committed to the preparation of preservice teachers and to the philosophy of the teacher preparation program. Cooperation among principal, teachers, and college representatives is essential. The college supervisor might better serve students and teachers as a consultant and, at the same time, forge a strong bond between the school and the college. The college supervisor, working collaboratively with the teacher in the training of the student, could provide inservice for the school in general and could continue to support the student during the year. Effective program research should examine the specific training program; the personalities, interaction styles, and perceptions of the student, inservice teacher, and college supervisor; and the climate of the school in which the experience takes place. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED222447

FIELD EXPERIENCE: WHAT IS IT? WHY IS IT OUT THERE?

There is no magic in field experiences. Professional training is not significant simply because it is "out there." (Howsam, 1976, p.93)

BRIAN K. DAVIS
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
APRIL 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Brian Kenneth Davis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 021 048

CONTENTS

Contents i

Purpose 1

Field Experience Defined 2

Interrelationship of Role Incumbents in the Field Experience 5

Theory Base of Field Experience 12

Research in Field Experience 16

The Is and the Might of Field Experience 19

Summary 28

References 30

PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper is to address a number of questions concerning the concept of field experience. Field experience is a commonly accepted term in teacher preparation usually taken to mean a period during which preservice teachers spend time in the public schools. The use of the public schools for the provision of teaching experience arose as a result of the inability of campus based facilities to handle the influx of students after World War II (Smith in collaboration with Silverman, Borg and Fry, 1980, p. 22). The concept of field experience is one that appears to be widely accepted as a fait accompli in the design of teacher education programs and in one form or another is often mandated by the state. For example, in the Standards for College or Universities Preparing Teachers adopted by the Ohio Board of Education on December 9, 1974 is the statement, "Each teacher education student shall satisfactorily participate in clinical experiences . . . ."

It is proposed that one steps back from this acceptance of field experience as a fait accompli of teacher preparation programs and examines as objectively as possible the concept of field experience. More specifically, what is meant by field experience? Who are its principal actors and what do we know about their interrelationships? What is the theoretical base for field experience? What does current research have to offer to our understanding of field experience? What goals are related to or might be related to field experience? This paper attempts to address these questions, each of which in and of itself could be the subject of a single paper.

FIELD EXPERIENCE DEFINED

The term 'field experience' has common usage both within and without education. There are a number of other terms which are used synonymously or are related to 'field experience'. These include laboratory experience, direct experience, clinical experience, experiential learning, teaching practice, practicum, internship, student teaching, and directed observation. Andrews (1964, p. 9-12) gave a number of useful definitions. Clinical experience is "carefully planned student contact with individuals and very small groups of learners under the direct supervision of skilled practitioners with the student making diagnoses, prognoses, and projecting treatment plans for individuals with learning problems." He further went on to say that "the term clinical is sometimes used to refer to all the direct experiences with children, youth, and adults interchangeably with the term professional laboratory experiences." These latter involve "all those contacts with children, youth, and adults in the school and community, including observation, participation, teaching, and other leadership activities which make a direct contribution to the understanding of basic concepts and principles as well as of individuals and their guidance in the teaching - learning process." Student teaching was defined as "a period of guided teaching when a college student assumes increasing responsibility for directing the learning of a group or groups of learners over a period of consecutive weeks." This may be confused with the term internship when the latter is used to refer to full-time off-campus student teaching or to a period of pre-certification experience as part of a fifth or sixth year program. Internship, as used by Andrews, is "that period when a college graduate having completed formal teacher education and holding an initial certificate, is employed part-time up to one year,

receives a salary proportionate to his service, is supervised-primarily by the school system but with a continuing relationship with college personnel, and follows a planned study program designed to produce a demonstrably competent, professional teacher" (emphases added). In the same way that receipt of a salary separates this kind of experience from teaching practice; directed observation experience may be distinguished in that it consists of "opportunities provided for students to see teaching, learning, and all manner of community activities without necessarily becoming involved in the on-going activity itself" (emphases added).

Johnson and Perry (1974) indicated that "after the first teacher training schools were established, the students in these schools gained practice by teaching demonstration lessons to their classmates. As normal schools were established, the students in these schools did practice teaching in model schools which were later called campus laboratory schools. Starting somewhere near 1950, the term "student teaching" replaced the term "practice teaching" and the preponderance of student teaching was done off-campus in the public schools." Student teaching was defined by Aichele (1978) as "a period of guided teaching during which the student, under the direction of a cooperating teacher, takes increasing responsibility for leading the school experiences of a given group of learners over an extended period of time and engages directly in many of the activities which constitute the wide range of a teacher's responsibilities."

Smith et al. (1980), who pointed out that "the development and use of professional knowledge in any field depends upon the development of a body of standard definitions" (p.59), appear to define clinical experiences as taking place in the college setting and consisting of protocols, minicourses, and other such visual, auditory, and transcribed materials as

exemplify behaviorally the concepts and principles of pedagogical knowledge (p.41) This work is to be parallelled by planned systematic observation and classroom experiences in the training laboratory. This "training laboratory" is the public school, and the combined school of pedagogy and public schools are refered to as the "clinical complex".

Elliot (1978), reported the most commonly accepted meaning of field experience to be "a teacher preparation experience that occurs away from the university classroom in a location that provides guided observation or interaction with either students or inservice personnel who are working with students." While 'guided' or 'supervised' is frequently specified, sometimes the term 'evaluated' is also included, as, for example, in Eisenberg (1980).

A definition of professional laboratory experiences might then be: all those guided contacts with children, youth, and adults in the school and community, including observation, participation, teaching and other leadership activities directly contributing to the evaluated understanding of concepts and principles of pedagogical knowledge.

Traditionally, field experience is an event that places a student teacher in the classroom of an inservice teacher with a member of the college faculty being in contact with the teacher and student. While these three are not the only actors in the experience they are perhaps the most significant and the next section will explore their interaction.

INTERRELATIONSHIP OF ROLE INCUMBENTS IN THE FIELD EXPERIENCE

The three most closely interacting role incumbents in the field experience are the student teacher, college supervisor, and the cooperating teacher. A simple, straightforward definition of cooperating teacher is to be found in the 1980 edition of the Ohio State University College of Education's Professional Introduction Instructor's Manual: an experienced teacher under whose guidance and in whose classroom the teacher candidate participates. The immediate question arises as to the role expectations of that teacher. Describing school experience that takes place in the junior year, Williamson (1979) listed the responsibilities of the cooperating teacher as

1. Preparing the students in his/her class for the university student's arrival.
2. Explaining school policies and procedures to the university student.
3. In participation activities, guiding the student in his/her assigned tasks, and providing the necessary materials and arrangements for the completion of tasks.
4. Providing each student with an understanding of the extent of his/her authority and responsibility.

The North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction (1973) serving as a guide for all field experiences in education listed seven suggestions for cooperating teachers and team leaders of which only the headings are reproduced here.

1. Help the student teacher develop a professional attitude toward all roles of the teacher.
2. Help the student maintain a wholesome self image, fully aware of his strengths and weaknesses.
3. Develop a classroom atmosphere that will encourage acceptance of the student teacher as co-worker.
4. Plan carefully for the gradual growth of the student teacher.
5. Help the student teacher develop positive, constructive approaches to pupil discipline.

6. Help the student teacher recognize evaluation as the chief means of professional growth and improvement.

7. Help the student teacher to gain confidence in teacher-parent conferences through participation in such conferences.

In this document the cooperating teacher was defined as "any instructional staff member who has direct responsibility for a college or university student who has been assigned to the school system for a field experience." It was further stated that the "cooperating teacher is directly responsible to the principal of the school in which the experience is provided" and that one of the prime responsibilities of the teacher was that of "working in close cooperation with the college or university supervisor."

The above examples are typical of the guidelines and expectations involving a classroom teacher in the business of field experience for student teachers. In many ways they are an improvement on the writer's perceptions of field experience both as a student teacher and as a cooperating teacher, when, to the best of his knowledge no such guidelines for the cooperating teacher were provided in either case.

More recently the role of the cooperating teacher as a sort of master craftsman under which the student experiences apprenticeship has been replaced by a more shared kind of relationship. Anderson (1978) warned against always thinking of supervision as involving collegial relationships in the sense of "working together as equals," "not involving ascendent roles," and "shared leadership." The point was made that the participation in and benefit from a collegial approach may be dictated by the maturity level of the inservice teachers; the degree to which they are "self actualized." This has obvious implications for the selection of cooperating teachers especially if a collegial relationship is intended with the college supervisor.

Collaboration between college and public school personnel is seen as a critical factor in field experience for student teachers during which "the student, the supervising teacher and the clinical professor interact in a carefully structured and empathic way so as to (at least in theory) maximize the learning potential of this unique collaborative and caring situation" (Hopkins, 1980). Hopkins further indicated that the dichotomy between the perceptions held by the school of the college and by the college of the school militates against successful collaboration.

Nevertheless, a number of programs have attempted to increase the potential for collaboration. Hawk (1980) reported the planning and implementation of practicum and laboratory experiences at the Ohio State Universtiy to be coordinated by a joint committee consisting of campus-based teacher educators, inservice teachers, preservice teachers, and adjunct professors. These last are the cooperating teachers. They act as seminar facilitators as well as coordinators of the preservice teacher's activities in the schools, for which they are financially compensated. Deakins, Dunn, Greenberg, Harwood, and Sellen (1977) described a similar arrangement under the title of the School-Based Supervision Team model which

> has the unique distinction of functioning autonomously, while maintaining adequate university contact and of being on site. The teachers that comprise the Team are 'working" staff members in the school. When teachers become Team members they not only maintain their teaching responsibilities they also take on a new role and responsibility as coordinators of the total on-site preservice program of their schools. . . . . contact with the university is maintained and is perceived as a guiding, reflective and analytical influence. This relationship is developed and communication is supported through periodic in-service sessions and through contact with resource persons representing different specific departments and subject areas at the university.

As Hopkins (1980) suggested, field experiences will be enhanced by the existence of philosophic compatibility between the goals of the

college and the public schools. He further added that the climate of the school - college interaction should be one of openess, warmth and frankness.

Unfortunately not all studies indicate a desire for such involvement by cooperating teachers. Both Bush (1975) and Kapel (1978) found that cooperating teachers did not desire a dramatic increase in involvement in the design, goal setting, and evaluation in field experiences even though they presently had little involvement in these areas. As suggested, this may be the result of teachers' perceptions of the relationship with the college as being unalterable.

Whether or not cooperating teachers wish to become more involved in the design and operation of field experiences and whether or not they perceive the colleges as prepared to treat them collegially the fact remains that numerous studies have documented the impact of the cooperating teacher upon the student teacher; students tend to imitate their teachers in the field (Henry, 1978). It follows that the supervising teacher must be prepared to be skilled in the role of teachers of future teachers (Copeland, 1977). In this respect the guideline for the cooperating teacher quoted in Aichele (1978) as

> a "master" teacher who has had at least three years of classroom teaching experience, is an active member of professional and educational organizations and activities, has special training for supervision through in-service workshops or coursework, and views this participation as a valuable contribution to his/her profession and to his/her own teaching abilities

is an improvement on our original definition and gives considerable direction for the selection of such personnel.

What sort of teachers are required then to become cooperating, supervisory or clinical teachers, as Smith (1980) refers to the role? The teacher will need to identify with the philosophy of the field

experience and this may mean a change in attitudes toward 'college education.' The teacher will need to be skilled not only in teaching, the demonstration of skills identified in the preparation of the student teacher, but also skillfull in supervising which will probably mean a willingness to be trained in this area. The teacher will have to be prepared to assume a truly responsible role not only in teaching the student teacher but in evaluation too. The teacher will clearly have to be prepared to take part in planning sessions and other forms of meeting with student teachers, college supervisors and other personnel. Lastly, and by no means least, the teacher must have a genuine commitment to the task for the rewards are less likely to be of the intrinsic kind. One further important need must be met and that is the need for the principal in whose school the teacher works to be as committed to the work as the teacher is.

It is my belief that the physical orientation of the supervisor should be the classroom and this means the cooperating teacher carries the load. Very close and frequent contact with the college supervisor would be necessary and some reward system for the cooperating teacher in the form of reduced teaching load and/or extra salary would be required. A joint position with college and school district might be contracted by which the college provides the extra salary and the district the time. Smith et. al. (1980) envisage this type of clinical teacher and arrangement:

> a team of clinical teachers would be constituted in each school to conduct the preparation of the trainees not only in the skills of classroom teaching but also in curriculum planning, participation in various school activities, and the development of skills in the various domains of training with special emphasis upon the ability to observe and diagnose the difficulties students encounter as they engage in the process of learning. (p. 27)

> To prepare clinical teachers, both college and school, the college will need to designate instructors to work cooperatively with teachers in the development of programs. (p. 28)

The number of teachers possessing the required abilities may well be small but, as Smith et al. (p. 21) suggested, if colleges of education admit only the number of students that they can adequately prepare then "one or two trainees per clinical teacher" should be sufficient (p. 45).

Given this supervisory role being assumed by the teacher in the public school, what remains for the college supervisor? Andrews (1976) suggested little extant research to support the belief that the college supervisor has any impact upon the student teacher's achievement and Morris (1974) reported little difference in the performance or adjustment of student teachers supervised by college personnel as compared to classroom teachers. Karmos and Jacko (1977) found that more than half of the students indicated the cooperating teacher as first in a list of those having most significant influence and less than one-third mentioned a college instructor at all. It is further suggested, that given the influence of cooperating teachers on the teaching confidence of student teachers, training in counselling skills, conference techniques and interpersonal skills should be considered.

Should the supervisors stop supervising? Perhaps, but not stop visiting the schools where they could act as resource consultants, work with groups of student teachers, groups of classroom teachers or combinations of both (Bowman, 1979). Cohn (1981) stated that a strong body of opinion currently holds that preservice supervision is more properly a responsibility of the cooperating teacher and that a major function of the supervisor should be to train the cooperating teacher for supervision of student teachers. If these supervising teachers are members of a joint team as discussed above the role of the college supervisor can

become one of liason, consultant, a sharer on a reciprocal basis of new and developing techniques for dealing with current problems and a joint teacher along with the cooperating teacher.

THEORY BASE OF FIELD EXPERIENCE

Is there a theoretical base upon which justification may be made for having a laboratory experience component in teacher preparation? Some might argue that not only does no theoretical base exist for the laboratory experience but no theoretical base exists for teaching per se. Smith et al. (1980) debunk the latter assertion, at the same time acknowledging that the origin of teaching is lost in antiquity (p. 79).

Imitation and teaching are a part of our cultural heritage. Initiation into arcane knowledge and the concept of apprenticeship have their antecedents in time immemorial. Teaching is a natural form of behavior. In addition it is one that is greatly dependent upon the characteristics of the learner, the conditions of the teaching environment and the interaction that takes place between these, the teacher and other variables, including temporal and material resources. This is to say, that while principles and concepts of teaching may be learned about from studying teaching the learning is taking place in a vacuum devoid of the rich context that first hand interaction with school children provides. The full meaning only becomes apparent through the participation in a true teaching situation which not only allows for assessment of understanding of concepts and principles but also permits actions to test and demonstrate them.

Today, it is widely accepted by the public and those in education that laboratory experiences are both necessary and worthwhile for preservice teachers (Joyce, Yarger, and Howey, 1977). Conant (1963, p. 142) in his landmark study refered to practice teaching as the one indisputably essential element in professional education, though he did suggest the importance of the student learning the job form a first rate teacher and under favorable circumstances (p. 122). The concept of experiential learning has been valued by students teachers and educators, alike

(eg., Dewey, 1904; Flowers, 1948; Conant, 1963; Innaccone, 1963; Silberman, 1970; Lortie, 1975; Chickering, 1977; Smith et al., 1980).

Justification for frequent involvement in field experiences during teacher preparation usually takes two forms (see for instance Ross, Raines, Cervetti and Dellow, 1980). The first is that there is a need for early exposure to the reality of teaching in order for those who have entered the preparation program erroneously to be able to withdraw before a needless waste of time and resources occurs. The second is that lacking the experiential background students have difficulty in interpreting concepts and principles which are very often then 'learned' for tests. That is, memorized and forgotten afterward or, if not forgotten, at least not put into effect when experiencing later direct contact with children.

Neither of the above persuasive arguments constitute a theoretical base although such may exist. Kolls and Fry (1975) presented the theoretical perspective that exposure to concrete experiences brings about observation and reflection on the part of the student leading to the formation of personal 'theories' and that as new situations are encountered these theories are tested out to create new perspectives in a continuing cycle. Smith et al. (1980, p. 91) argued for a model that commences with rigorous grounding in definitional knowledge as the basis for a guide to objective observation followed by the third step in this sequence which is that of performance. The primary difference appears to be along the lines of a heuristic-didactic dichotomy of approach. While the former may contribute to the formation of personal philosophies and teaching styles the latter has the advantage of setting the groundwork such that observations when made will be made neutrally so to speak without the emotionality and misinterpretation that may result from uninformed perceptions.

One of the oft heard criticisms of teacher education programs is that the theoretical knowledge engendered during college courses is of little help in concrete situations in the classroom. Waller (1967, p. 192) suggested that when this occurs the student "gives up and takes his guidance from conventional sources, from the advice of older teachers, the proverbs of the fraternity, and the commandments of principals." Recently there have been serious questions raised as to the efficacy of laboratory experiences as they are presently constituted. These will be discussed shortly.

Returning to the initial question of a theory base for laboratory experiences, Cottrell (1956, p. 16) stated that:

> As in all professions, the preparation of teachers has proceeded from the simple, intuitive practices to the highly organized and scientifically founded programs that are coming to characterize the modern college of teacher education.

Scientifically founded programs do not necessarily have a theoretical base or experimental support. Andrews (1964, p. 14) states that the whole area of field experience "Has evolved largely under the impact of programmatic pressures, rather than from any generally accepted theoretical base" and further asserts that "Neither formal research nor theoretical statements give much assistance in identifying the effects of the use of direct experiences as an integral part of the teacher - education curriculum."

Although, as has been stated earlier, it is generally believed that experience in the schools by student teachers necessarily contributes to the development of better teachers, Elliott as recently as 1978 remarked that

> What does exist in the literature related to field experiences is a large body of material describing practices and a limited number of studies of the effectiveness of those practices or the theoretical bases on which they were developed. Since the field experience is an attempt to put theory into practice, investigators generally must determine the theoretical bases they wish to explore and find examples of how those theories have been put into operation. Unfortunately most of the descriptions of practice comprising

> the main body of the literature do not describe extensively the theoretical bases on which they were designed. (Elliott, 1978, p.3)

It would appear then that there is little justification for saying that field experience has a theoretical base. At this point it might be useful to turn to research in field experience to see if the findings provide any definitive information relating ends to means.

RESEARCH IN FIELD EXPERIENCE

> Perhaps one reason so little research has been done about field experiences is that, as virtually the only component common to teacher education across the country, field experiences enjoy such a high degree of content validity they are almost above question. This is especially true of the student teaching dimension of the field experience program. (Elliott 1978, p. 3)

> Curiously absent from the list of needs for early field experience is a need based on research that documents emphatically that it will produce better teachers. Unfortunately, nobody yet has been able to prove completely that early or even late field experiences produce a better professional educator. (Elliott, 1979, p. 9)

Zeichner (1980) explored the myths and realities of field-based experiences in preservice teacher education. Defining a myth as "a set of widely held beliefs that give meaning to events independent of the truth or falsity of the beliefs", the first to be considered was that practical school experience contributes to the development of better teachers. A number of studies were cited related to the contention that "field-based experiences are conservative institutions which merely serve to socialize prospective teachers into established patterns of school practice." The second myth explored related to the increased conservatism that students display the more time they spend in the schools. Opposing contentions, then, take the form of the efficacy of field experiences versus the coercive effects experienced.

In reviewing the research literature Zeichner, while remarking that it is difficult to draw any clear implications concluded that "Field-based experiences are neither all beneficial in their effects as the abundant testimonials and the increased emphasis on these experiences would have us believe; nor are they merely vehicles for adapting new personnel into existing patterns as many critics would have us believe." He further makes the point that "Few researchers have actually looked at what takes place during the experience itself: How students are shaped by and in turn

shape the institutions in which they work." Although support for those claiming total coercion during field experience comes from studies on the influence of the cooperating teacher, the ecology of the classroom, and the school bureaucracy and the development of utilitarian attitudes by student teachers (if it works, it's good), Zeichner maintained that existing studies provide no evidence tying the development of more conservative attitudes by the end of the field experience to the experience itself.

Other explanations for the so-called socialization effect not related directly to the field experience are cited (see Zeichner and Tabachnick, 1981). Studies are criticized on the basis of ignoring discrepant cases where, on examination, there was evidence of overt resistance by student teachers to imposed constraints, thus "Refuting the highly deterministic view of socialization associated with the myth of total coercion." Lacey (1977, p. 48) is quoted in that "Too much emphasis has been given to the obvious fact that the (conservative) change occurs, and too little attention paid to the partial and incomplete nature of the change."

Given this differential impact on student teachers it is neither possible to justify recent mandates such as the State of Ohio increasing the number of hours of field experience nor condemn field experience as entirely detrimental to the preparation of thoughtful, reflective teachers. In many ways we must apply to field experiences a question posed some years ago about teaching in general by Fuller and Bown (1975, p. 52), not "are we right" but "What is out there?" The quality of the experience, not the experience itself, must be studied.

Such studies should address specificity in the type of training program, cooperating teacher, college supervisor, school principal, and student teacher, including the last's commitment to teaching, perceptions of self-esteem and other biographical factors. Conflict between programs and experience should

be examined as well as combinations that support the kinds of teaching that is exemplified in college courses. Until this approach is made the practicality of field experience is in doubt.

Clearly field experience does something for those undergoing it. An important question is whether or not what is done is a goal of the field experience. It is appropriate now to examine goals in field experience.

THE IS AND THE MIGHT OF FIELD EXPERIENCE

Dewey (1904) in stating that the key to learning to teach is the relationship between theory and practice went on to say that the ultimate aim of field experience determines the direction it should take. He described the different aims of two approaches to field experience: apprenticeship, where the aim is primarily practical, the development of skill and proficiency in the job of teaching, and the laboratory approach whose aim is that of supplying the intellectual method and material of competent teachers and is the means of making the theoretical instruction come alive.

> The aim of the laboratory concept is at control of intellectual methods required for personal and independent mastery of practical skill, rather than the turning out of masters of the craft . . . . (T)his necessarily involves considerable postponement of skill in the routine and technique of the profession until, in this case, the teacher candidate after graduation begins teaching. (Dewey, 1904, p. 2)

The goals of experiental activities for students in teaching may be as varied as the terminologies used to define the experiences. Nevertheless, some general goals may be described. Among these is that of bringing about understanding of principles and concepts, development of professional skills, provision for exploration of teaching as a career, and determining a student's readiness for certification. These are not common to all experiences, often being dependent upon the point in the teacher preparation program at which the experience occurs. Cottrell (1956) stated that "Selection (of the experience) depends both on the goals sought and on the nature of the learning process" (p. 59). He saw the need to provide direct experience

> when the student does not have adequate previous contacts by which he can meaningfully interpret a new situation . . . . direct experience is also needed when the student can thus be helped to see his needs more clearly or when he desires to test his ability to act in keeping with his developing concepts and skills (p. 69).

Flowers (1948) indicated the general goals of field experience to be

> to help the student gain understanding of children, of the role of the teacher in the classroom, of the total school program, and of the interrelationship of school and community, and to provide for continuous professional growth of teachers in preparation. (p. 83)

He further presented nine principles relevant to field experience programs and these included:

> Principle I: The particular contribution of professional laboratory experiences (including student teaching) to the education of the teachers is three-fold:
>
> (1) an opportunity to implement theory--both to study the pragmatic value of the theory and to check with the student his understanding of the theory in application;
>
> (2) a field of activity which, through raising questions and problems, helps the student to see his needs for further study; and
>
> (3) an opportunity to study with the student his ability to function effectively when guiding actual teaching-learning situations . . . .
>
> Principle II: The nature and extent of professional laboratory experiences should be planned in terms of the abilities and needs of the student and should be an integral part of the total program of guidance . . . .
>
> Principle III: Recognized individual differences in point of beginning laboratory experiences, in the nature of the experiences themselves, in their sequence, and in the length of time of continuing the activity . . . .
>
> Principle IV: The professional program should be so designed as to afford opportunity for responsible participation in all of the important phases of the teacher's activities, both in and out of school . . . .
>
> Principle V: Professional laboratory experiences should be cooperatively developed by the student and his advisors. Adequate supervision and guidance should be provided through cooperative efforts of laboratory and college teachers. . . .
>
> Principle VI: Professional laboratory experiences should be integrated with other phases of the student's program . .
>
> Principle VII: Evaluation of professional laboratory experiences should be in terms of growth in understandings and abilities needed in the situations faced by the teacher working in our democracy . . . . .

> Principle VIII: Physical facilities should be adequate to provide a range of firsthand experiences with children, youth, and adults in varied school, home, and community situations . . . .
>
> Principle IX: Professional laboratory experiences should be developed to recognize needed continuity in the preservice and in-service educational programs. . . . (pp. 16-34)

Althof (1979) produced the following basic guidelines important to effective field experience as a result of a review of the literature:

1. Both personal development and academic retention are enhanced through field experience . . . . (Quinn, 1972; Keeton, 1978)
2. Field experience activity should be determined by a student's current interests . . . . (Dewey, 1938)
3. Field experience should precede, coincide with and intervene between basic courses . . . . (Coleman, 1975)
4. Field experience should be problem- or task-oriented. . . (Dewey, 1951)
5. Field experience curriculum should be structured to insure an appropriate continuum of personal support of basic skills and conceptual processes . . . . (Sanford, 1967)
6. Responsibilities should vary in complexity with a student's developmental advancement in both his formal curriculum and his experiences in the field. . . . (Sanford, 1967)
7. Learning activities in the field experience program should be jointly determined by the field situation, the student's developmental level, and a placement activity to the student . . . . (Dewey, 1938)
8. Misalignment between the field experience setting and the student's cognitive level will advance, slow, halt, or regress a student's developmental progress. . . . (Perry, 1970) (Flowers, 1948, p. 136)

Elliot (1979) saw the intent of field experience programs as being

> to introduce students to career opportunities in education, to provide enough exposure to allow both the university and the student to determine whether teaching is an appropriate career choice, and to provide some initial experiences in the teaching-learning process. (p. 18)

Elliott (1979) also saw the value of early field experience as being that the student

> has the opportunity to examine his personal ideas about schools and teaching in light of the reality of the situation. With early field experiences the preservice teacher can also more accurately determine the grade level and kinds of students he finds most interesting and appealing. (p. 18)

Other goals of no less importance exist, such as development of self perception, and the development of an understanding of the diversity in the role of the teacher. Andrews (1964) offered a list of ten goals similar to these above and indicated their relationship to different experiences in teacher education.

1. Providing a basis for a <u>personal</u> decision to become a teacher.
2. Developing <u>readiness</u> for professional courses, professional experiences, professional growth and for full-responsibility teaching.
3. Developing mature professional purposes and attitudes.
4. Strengthening understanding by exposure to reality which adds feeling and other sensory impressions to verbalized knowledge.
5. Providing an opportunity to acquire, use, and test information.
6. Developing professional understanding of concepts and theories from professional and related disciplines.
7. Developing skill in the use of professional techniques.
8. Developing insight and judgment in applying professional knowledge.
9. Providing a basis for evaluating professional, social, and personal growth.
10. Providing a feeling of significant personal worth, the satisfaction that comes from giving useful professional services. (pp. 23-24)

At the time of writing, Andrews commented that research to establish the relationships was virtually nonexistent.

Not only may the above objectives be most applicable at different phases of the teacher education program but they may also be perceived in

varying degrees of importance by the different people involved, the student, the school administrator, the practitioner (cooperating teacher), and the college supervisor. Tittle (1974) found that the development of self-confidence was of primary importance to student teachers and cooperating teachers whereas it ranked second to the ability to apply theory in the perceptions of supervisors and administrators. This ability to apply theory ranked lowest in the perceptions of student teachers.

Perhaps the goal that has received greatest attention is that of integrating theory and practice through experiences in the schools. Dewey's philosophical position regarding this goal has been reduced in its everyday form to the concept of 'learning by doing' although he clearly differentiated between experience intended to develop skill and experience intended to support theory. Dewey (1904, p. 3) suggested that given the limited time available for the training process that this time could be used best by laying scientific foundations which could not be adequately secured experientially in the school whereas technical skills could.

> In theory the principles of psychology, logic, and history of education are dominant; in practice, the moving forces are the devices and methods which are picked up through blind experimentation, through examples which are not rationalized, through precepts which are more or less arbitrary and mechanical, through advice based upon the experience of others. This leads to the formation of habits of work which have an empirical rather than a scientific sanction. (Dewey, 1904, p. 11).

> Experience should begin with observation which allows the teacher candidate to observe with reference to seeing the interaction of "mind with mind." The teacher candidate needs to observe psychologically for personal insight and initiative rather than practically for imitation or to see what "works." (p. 14)

> After psychological observation, practical observation will not tend to produce copiers. Properly prepared students will be able to convert practical observations to their psychological equivalents to know how and why something worked . . . . Only by beginning with the values and laws contained in the student's own experience of his own mental growth, and by proceeding gradually to facts connected with other persons of whom he can know little, and by proceeding

> still more gradually to influence the mental operations of others, can educational theory be made most effective. (p. 14)

Dewey (1904) and Smith et al. (1980) are in agreement regarding the order and nature of field experience: it should be a part of a formal course, closely coordinated and integrated for instructional purposes but treated separately for evaluation and grading. The aim of initial field experience should be primarily the mastery of clinical knowledge and skills of evaluation. Smith et al. suggest that the experiences begin with the domain of observation and proceed through that of diagnosis, planning, management, communication and evaluation (p. 84).

In addition Smith et al. suggested that the student teacher should experience a brief introduction to actual teaching. It must be remembered that this would not take place prior to the fifth year in the Smith et al. design.

> The trainee may serve as a teacher of a small group; as a diagnostician working with one or two children who need special help, or as a tutor of one or more exceptional children . . . (with) progressive increase in the amount of responsibility for classwork or as nearly that as the training lab can allow. (p. 44)

Dewey's thoughts on the post-observation progression were as follows:

> After the psychological observation phase the teacher candidate needs consecutive and systematic exercise in the consideration of the subject matter of the elementary and high schools. Making isolated and independent lesson plans for a few days in a separate grade here or there is likely to be detrimental. What is needed is the habit of viewing the entire curriculum as a continuous growth, reflecting the growth of mind. (Dewey, 1904, p. 15)

> After acquiring psychological insight and a good working acquaintance with educational problems, the teacher candidate can work as an assistant, which would enable the future teacher to make the transition from psychological and theoretical insight to the observation of the more technical points of classroom teaching and management. After assisting, teacher candidates could be given actual teaching with a maximum liberty--not closely supervised, nor minutely and immediately criticised upon either the content or the method of their teaching. There should be critical discussion regarding the results, with the work of the supervisor being directed at

> getting the student to judge his work critically. What is wanted is not technical skill but an awareness in the teacher candidate of what the educational development of a subject means and, in some typical case, command of a methods of control. After the above conditions are met, students who have gone through the stages already referred to should be ready for work of the apprenticeship type which could be compared to a traditional student teaching experience. (p. 23)

Dewey, unlike Smith, saw professional training as a part of the total curriculum, as does the writer.

A major challenge for teacher educators appears to be not the provision of field experiences but the provision of field experiences beneficial to the student teacher. Dewey viewed field experiences as growth experiences but made it clear that the two are not automatically equivalent when he said that "Any experience is mis-educative if it has the effect of arresting or distorting the growth of further experience" (Dewey, 1904, p. 14). The major goal of field experience was to develop in the student the ability to reflect upon education, to be thoughtful and alert. The goal was not that of attaining immediate proficiency in the skills of teaching. Smith (1980) echoes this idea when he states that

> the skills of teaching cannot be acquired by formal courses in method, or by uncontrolled experience in practice situations, or by any other means than that of <u>systematic and progressive training</u>. (p. 85, emphases added)

Cottrell (1956) further explicated this:

> Experience, as Dewey points out, is a continuum. Each experience both "takes up something from those which have gone before and modifies in some way those which come after." It is the central problem of education to provide educative experiences--those which contribute to further creative experiences judged desirable in terms of the needs of the ~~needs of the~~ individual and the social standards of the culture to which he belongs. These are experiences which include reflection upon the meaning of what is experienced and which increase ability to direct the course of subsequent activities so that desirable changes are brought about in both the individual and his environment. This selection (of experiences) depends both on the goals sought and on the nature of the learning process. (p. 62)

He further asserted that "the more closely learning experiences resemble the situations in which the learning will be used the more adequate they will be". (pp. 64-65). Haberman (1978) saw education's task in field experience to be one of creating experiences that bring the reality of the classroom home to the preservice teacher yet at the same time do not serve to destroy the high ideals held by that person (p. 16). He suggested that

> teacher education programs prepare students for the best of all non-existent worlds and then toss them into public schools where, quite frequently, the antithesis of everything the university program is trying to teach is an accepted, operating norm. (p. 8)

As Waller (1967) put it:

> the student teacher learns the most advanced theory of education, and goes out from school with a firm determination to put it into practice. But he finds that this theory gives him little help in dealing with the concrete social situation that faces him. After a few attempts to translate theories into educational practice, he gives up and takes his guidance from conventional sources, from the advice of older teachers, the proverbs of the fraternity, and the commandments of principals. (p. 192)

Student teachers should not be sent out into reality situations without the bases for understanding what is happening there. Without those bases they will learn to practice only what 'works". This concept more closely ralates to an apprenticeship model with the tendancy to obviate the need for teacher education as so many, from Dewey to Smith, see it.

Perhaps the crucial questions educators must ask themselves about field experience is is it designed to alert students to the reality as compared to the ideal and is it designed to test the students' ability to survive in that reality? If the answer to both of these are in the affirmative then the design is distinctly limited. From the foregoing discourse it can be seen that a field experience should allow the student to reflect upon the situation, relate what is happening in practice to

theory -- and vice versa -- apply skills and principles that are relevant to the situation. As a result the student will grow in understanding, both of the situation and the knowledge brought to bear on it. In a situation where survival, proving oneself, demonstrating the ability to be in control - being able to 'teach' - is required there is more likely to be recourse to the means described by Waller above. If the ends of field experience are not to be merely socialization into the pragmatic reality of the in-service teacher then the means -- the experience -- must avoid that in the design. As Dewey (1904) says, "Everything depends upon the quality of the experience" (p. 16), and as Flowers (1948) stated, "The greatest benefit is derived where laboratory experiences are coordinated with the total program ---- where guidance is a cooperative venture of college and laboratory teachers (p. 83, emphases added).

Tom (1980) argued that while the notion of apprenticeship in preservice teacher education has been condemned widely, it is in fact practiced extensively in the form of student teaching (p. 321). Tom suggested that teaching is a moral craft which has a more interactive relationship between knowledge and practice than the belief based in a scientific approach holding that theory ought to be studied prior to practice. It was emphasized that the apprenticeship concept did not mean blindly following the behavior of the cooperating teacher but employing analysis, judgement and moral sensitivity to the classroom events as a result of clinical supervision of the experience (p. 321). Once again, the critical issue is the guidance that is provided the student teacher.

SUMMARY

There appears to be a generalized tendency to refer to any activity that places preservice teachers in the schools in an observational or participative capacity as field experience. There is presently a trend for refering to the experience in the schools as a laboratory experience. Sometimes this is further clarified by the addition of 'planned' or 'supervised' to 'laboratory experience' though it is hard to conceive of justification for the experience being either unplanned or unsupervised. The addition of these words to the term field experience does not necessarily mean that the experience is either planned or supervised to any great degree.

The planning usually refers to an attempt at articulation between campus based activities and those in the public school and follows a developmental sequence often proceeding from observation to full teaching. While this may be so, the guidance in or supervision of such experiences often falls primarily to the lot of the inservice teacher in whose classroom the experience takes place. Strong reliance is also placed upon the practitioner to exemplify desired behaviors for teacher education students. Thus procedures for selection of school and classroom become essential facets of field experience program design, as do professional programs for the inservice teacher.

The professional and personal maturity of the classroom teacher needs to be considered as does that teacher's skill in teaching and supervising. The teacher (and principal) needs to be committed to the preparation of preservice teachers and to the philosophy of the teacher preparation program. Cooperation between principal, teacher and college representative is essential.

The college representative, often called the supervisor might better serve both the student and teacher as a consultant and at the same time forge a strong liason between the school and the college. Familiarity of the college instructor and inservice teacher with one another's world would enhance the relationship, especially for the student teacher. The college instructor could work collaboratively with the teacher in training the student, could provide inservice for the school in general and could continue to support the student during the neophyte year. A reward system, both extrinsic and intrinsic, would be required to attract the calibre of inservice teachers required whose classroom would permit the testing and demonstration of concepts and principles. This could take the form of adjunct faculty status in the college, a reduced teaching load, and remuneration from the college.

There does not seem in the literature to be a strong theoretical base for the concept of field experience. Nor does the research literature clearly support the efficacy of field experience in preparing competent teachers. Evaluation of field experience typically reports perceptions of student teachers, college instructors, and classroom teachers as to the value of the experience. Little evidence exists of comprehensive research/evaluation designs that are directed at finding out exactly what happens to the student during these experiences. The specific training program should be examined, the personality of the student, inservice teacher, college instructor and their interaction style as well as the perceptions of these individuals and the climate of the school in which the experience takes place.

REFERENCES

Aichele, Douglas B. General Guidelines for Cooperating Teachers. Oklahoma State University, Stillwater Oklahoma, July 1978.

Althof, James E. The social psychology of field experience education: some applications to the liberal arts. Alternative Higher Education, 4, (2), Winter 1979, pp. 127-139.

Anderson, Eugene M. Two Approaches to Clinical Supervision. Paper, presented at location unspecified. February 2, 1978.

Andrews, L. O. Student Teaching. Center for Applied Research in Education Inc.: New York, 1965.

Andrews, L. O. The College Supervisor's Role: Changing or Disappearing. Teacher Education in Practice, 1, (2), January 1976, pp. 1-2.

Bowman, Novy. College Supervision of Student Teaching: A Time to Reconsider. Journal of Teacher Education, 31, (3), May-June 1979, pp. 29-30.

Bush, Ann G. The Cooperating Teacher's Role in Decisionmaking Within the Elementary Student Teaching Field Program at Temple University as Perceived by Cooperating Teachers and College of Education Administrators. Unpublished Dissertation, Tmeple University, 1975.

Chickering, A. W. Experience and Learning: An Introduction to Experiential Learning. Change Magazine Press: New Rochelle, N.Y., 1977.

Cohn, Marilyn. A New Supervision Model for Linking Theory to Practice. Journal of Teacher Education, 32, (3), May-June 1981, pp. 26-30.

Conant, J. The Education of American Teachers. McGraw-Hill: New York, 1963.

Copeland, Willis D. Some Factors Related to Student Teacher Classroom Performance Following Microteaching Training. American Educational Research Journal, 14, (2), Spring 1977, pp. 147-157.

Cottrell, Donald P. (ed.) Teacher Education for a Free People. AACTE: New York, 1956.

Deakins, Karen; Anna C. Dunn, James D. Greenberg Thomas Harwood, and Janet Sellen. The School-Based Supervision Team: An Alternative. ERIC document, 1977.

Dewey, John. The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education. In The Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education, Charles A. McMurry (ed.). Public School Publishing Co.: Bloomington, Illinois, 1904.

Eisenberg, Michael. Field Work Program Guide. School of Information Studies: Syracuse, N.Y., 1980, ERIC document.

Elliott, Peggy G. Field Experiences in Preservice Teacher Education Bibliographies on Educational Topics No. 9. ERIC clearinghous on Teacher Education: Washington, D.C., August 1978.

Elliott, Peggy G., and Robert E. Mays. Early field experience in teacher education. Phi Delta Kappa Fastback 125, 1979.

Flowers, John G. Sub-Committee of the Standards and Surveys Committee, School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. American Association of Teachers Colleges: Oneonta, N.Y., 1948.

Fuller, F., and Brown, O. On Becoming a Teacher. In K. Ryan (ed.), Teacher Education (The 74th National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook). University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1975.

Haberman, Martin. Toward more realistic teacher education. Action in Teacher Education 1, (1), Summer 1978, pp. 8-17.

Hawk, Donald E. Practicum and Laboratory Experiences: A Conceptual Model. ERIC document, 1980.

Henry, Marvin A. Student Teaching: The State of the Art. Paper presentated at AACTE in Chicago, February 22, 1978.

Hopkins, David. The Role of Practicum in Bridging the Gap Between School and University. ERIC document, March 1980.

Howsam, Robert B; Dean C. Corrigan George W. Denemark, and Robert J. Nash. Educating A Profession. AACTE: Washington, 1976.

Innacone, L. Student Teaching: A Transitional State in the Making of a Teacher. Theory into Practice, 2, April 1963, pp. 73-80.

Joyce, B., Yarger, S., and Howey, K. Preservice Teacher Education. Center for Educational Research, Stanford University: Palo Alto, 1977.

Kapel, David E. Career Education Training and Role Perceptions of Cooperating Teachers Toward the Field Experience. Paper presented at the Eastern Educational Research Association Meeting in Williamsburg, Virginia, March 1978.

Karmos, A.H., and Jacko C.M. The Role of Significant Others During the Student Teaching Experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 28, (5), September - October 1977, pp. 51-55.

Kolb, D. A., and Fry, R. Toward An Applied Theory of Experiential Learning. In C. Cooper (ed.), Theories of Group Processes. John Wiley: New York, 1975.

Lacey, C. The Socialization of Teachers. Methuen: London, 1977.

Lortie, D. C. School-teacher: A Sociological Study. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1975.

Morris, J. R. The Effects of the University Supervisor on the Performance and Adjustment of Student Teachers. The Journal of Educational Research, 67, (8), April 1974, pp. 358-362.

North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction. Professional Laboratory Experience in Teacher Education. ERIC document, 1973.

Ross, Steven M., Franklin B. Raines, Michael J. Corvetti, and Donald A. Dellow. Field Experiences for Teacher Candidates: A Comparison Between Tutorial and Apprenticeship Programs on Student Activities and Attitudes. Journal of Teacher Education, 31, (6), November-December 1980, pp. 57-61.

Silberman, C. E. Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of an American Education. Random House: New York, 1970.

Smith, B. Othaniel, in collaboration with Stuart H. Silverman, Jean M. Borg, and Betty V. Fry. A Design for a School of Pedagogy. U.S. Department of Education: Washington, D.C., 1980.

Tittle, Carol K. Student Teaching: Attitude and Research Bases for Change in School and University. Scarecrow Press: Metuchen, N.J., 1974.

Tom, Alan R. Teaching as a Moral Craft: A Metaphor for Teaching and Teacher Education. Curriculum Enquiry, 10, (3), 1980, pp. 317-323.

Waller, Willard. The Sociology of Teaching. John Wiley: New York, 1967.

Williamson, John A. An Emerging Early Field Experience Program. ERIC document, 1979.

Zeichner, Kenneth M. Myths and Realities: Field-Based Experiences in Preservice Teacher Education. Journal of Teacher Education, 31, (6), November - December 1980, pp. 45-55.